UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,213	08/05/2003	David Haffner	GLAUKO.011CP1	6863
20995 7590 04/04/2008 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			EXAMINER	
			DOWE, KATHERINE MARIE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3734	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/04/2008	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com eOAPilot@kmob.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/634,213	HAFFNER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	KATHERINE M. DOWE	3734
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPOWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IF Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind  d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21.  2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) Th  3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4)  Claim(s) 5,7-9,11,27,28,37 and 53-73 is/are   4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdres 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 5,7-9,11,27,28,37 and 53-73 is/are is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) is/are objected to restriction and/	rejected.	
	oor	
<ul> <li>9) The specification is objected to by the Examir</li> <li>10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2007 is,</li> <li>Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre</li> <li>11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examir</li> </ul>	/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sedection is required if the drawing(s) is objection	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burest * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat fority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/21/2007 and 4/2/2007.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5)  Notice of Informal F 6)  Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/634,213 Page 2

Art Unit: 3734

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The following is a complete response to the amendment filed 12/21/2007.

2. Claims 5, 7-9, 11, 27, 28, 37, and 53-73 are currently pending.

### **Drawings**

3. The drawings were received on 12/21/2007. These drawings are acceptable.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

4. The indicated allowability of claims 5-9, 11, 12, 27, 28, 37, and 53-60 is withdrawn in view of the reconsideration of reference(s) to Richter et al. (US 5,968,058) and Mercerau et al. (US 6,450,937). Rejections based on the reconsidered reference(s) follow.

### Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5, 7-9, 11, 27, 28, 37, and 53-73 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 7. Claims 5, 7-9, 11, 27, 28, 37, and 53-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richter et al. (US 5,968,058) in view of Mercerau et al. (US

6,450,937). Richter et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed including an instrument and method for delivering implants for treating an ophthalmic condition. The instrument (Fig. 13) comprises a trocar (164) with a cutting edge sufficiently sharp to cut through Schlemm's canal and a biocompatible implant (130) with a cutting edge (158), where the implant is sized to convey aqueous humor from the anterior chamber to fluid outflow path of the eye so as to reduce elevated intraocular pressure (col 2, ln 48-57). The method comprises using the instrument to deliver the implant through a wall of Schlemm's canal, which extends from the sclera into the anterior chamber of the eye (col 5, In 5-14). The delivery location is determined by imaging collector channel locations (col 3, In 35-43). However, Richter et al. do not disclose an outer tubular elongate body surrounds the implant and trocar. Mercerau et al. disclose a device for delivering implants to selected body tissue comprising an outer tubular elongate body (12) surrounding a trocar (14) and implant (50). Mercerau et al. teach the outer tubular elongate body comprises a cutting edge (20) for piercing the tissue and forming a bore for delivery of the implant. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Richter et al. to include an outer tubular elongate body with a cutting edge surrounding the trocar and implant. The smooth outer tubular elongate body would provide a straight, even insertion path, thereby causing less trauma to the eye tissue.

Page 3

Additionally, Richter et al. do not disclose a plurality of implants. Mercerau et al. disclose delivering a plurality of implants (50) into body tissue with a single delivery device such that first and second implants may be delivered to first and second

Page 4

locations within the body without removing the delivery device from the body. The implants (50) are arranged end to end within the elongate body (12) and are serially dispensed from the elongate body by actuating a pushing member (16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Richter et al. such that the implant comprised a plurality of implants arranged end to end and the device comprised an actuator that serially dispenses the implants within the body. Thus, additional implants may readily be introduced into the eye to better treat severe intraocular pressure build up by providing additional channels to convey aqueous humor from the anterior chamber without requiring additional surgical intervention to deliver each implant individually.

Further regarding claims 28 and 73, Richter et al. and Mercerau et al. disclose the method substantially as claimed as shown above. However, the prior art does not specifically teach first and second implants are delivered to first and second locations that are angularly spaced at least 20 degrees. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Mercerau et al. such that when multiple implants were used, first and second implants were spaced at least 20 degrees, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art (*In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215). Furthermore, it would have been obvious to try placing the first and second implants at least 20 degrees apart since it is obvious to choose from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success.

Application/Control Number: 10/634,213 Page 5

Art Unit: 3734

#### Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KATHERINE M. DOWE whose telephone number is (571)272-3201. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jackie Ho can be reached on (571) 272-4696. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kevin T. Truong/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3734

Katherine Dowe March 28, 2008

/K. M. D./ Examiner, Art Unit 3734